

**Remarks**

This is in response to the Election/Restriction Requirement mailed August 17, 2005.

**Restriction/Election Requirement**

Restriction to one of the following inventions was required under 35 U.S.C. §121:

**Group I:** Claims 1-10 and 19-24; and

**Group II:** Claims 11-18.

The Applicant elects with traverse the invention of Group I, with claims 1-10 and 19-24 readable thereon.

The election is respectfully made with traverse on the basis that the product and the product-by-process of Group I could not reasonably be made with a process other than that set forth by the method of Group II.

Group I claim 19 generally features “steps for concurrently over-molding a platform portion with a first polymer and a distinct second polymer.”

Group II claim 10 generally features “concurrently over-molding a platform portion with a first polymer and a distinct second polymer.”

In view of the identical language employed above in these respectively restricted claims, it is difficult to see how that the Examiner could reasonably justify the above restriction between Groups I and II.

The Examiner’s suggestion that “the product as claimed could be made by another and materially different process such as by utilizing etching or laser cutting to form the

metallic substrate" is respectfully viewed as being without merit. The term metallic substrate does not even appear in any of the three independent claims 1, 11 and 19. Rather, each of these independent claims generally recite a platform portion that is overmolded.

Any variations with regard to the manner in which the recited "platform portion" is initially formed would thus be equally applicable to all of the independent claims, and so this is a meaningless basis for restriction.

Finally, the Applicant respectfully points out that Group I independent claim 19 is written in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph, thereby constituting a proper linking claim between Group I independent apparatus claim 1 and Group II independent method claim 11. See MPEP 809.03. Thus, if the restriction is maintained and claim 19 is allowed, the Applicant respectfully points out that the Examiner will be obliged to examine the non-elected method claims 11-18 as well. See e.g., MPEP 809.04.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction/election requirement.

If, however, the restriction/election requirement is sustained and the Group II claims 11-18 are withdrawn by the Examiner, upon allowance of linking claim 19, the Applicant further requests examination and allowance of the Group II claims.

### Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims 1-24 in the application. This is intended to be a complete response to the Restriction/Election Requirement mailed August 17, 2005.

Should any questions arise concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the below signed attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Randall K. McCarthy, Registration No. 39,297  
Mitchell K. McCarthy, Registration No. 38,794  
Fellers, Snider, Blankenship, Bailey and Tippens, P.C.  
Bank One Tower  
100 N. Broadway, Suite 1700  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102  
Telephone: (405) 232-0621  
Facsimile: (405) 232-9659  
Customer No. 33900